

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Amendments

Non-elected claims 10-21, 23 and 25 remain cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, independent claims 1, 22, 24 and 26 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below. Moreover, dependent claims 3 and 29 have also been amended. Finally, new claim 36 has been added.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 22, 24, 26-28 and 32-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Oda et al. (U.S. 5,204,662), Kawamura et al. (JP 07-131470) and Osakabe et al. (U.S. 5,666,363). Further, claims 4-6 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Oda, Osakabe, Kawamura and Davies et al. (U.S. 7,360,236). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 22, 24 and 26 for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a signal switching device including a reading unit operable to (1) read information indicating a physical address of the switching device, the physical address being generated by an output destination device that is an output destination of

a video signal. Further, claim 1 recites that the signal switching device includes an outputting unit that (2) outputs, to each respective input source device of the plurality of input source devices, the respective physical address generated by an address setup unit based on the physical address of the signal switching device, such that each respective physical address corresponds to an input source device of the plurality of input source devices.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Kawamura for teaching the features of the claimed reading unit and outputting unit (see, for example, the last paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action). However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which specifically add new limitations to the reading unit and the outputting unit, it is clear that Kawamura fails to disclose or suggest above-identified distinguishing features (1) and (2) as required by claim 1.

Rather, Kawamura merely teaches that a parent node A permits a child node B to assign a node ID to itself (see Fig. 9, col. 2, lines 20-23, and col. 3, lines 1-10 of U.S. 5,563,886 to Kawamura, which corresponds to JP 07-131470 to Kawamura as cited in the present rejection).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Kawamura teaches that the child node assigns a node ID to itself at the instruction of the parent node, but fails to disclose or suggest the reading unit that reads information indicating a physical address of the switching device, such that the physical address is generated by an output destination device that is an output destination of a video signal, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, it is also apparent that, because Kawamura fails to disclose or suggest that the physical address of the switching device is generated by the output destination, Kawamura also fails to disclose or suggest the outputting unit that outputs, to each respective input source

device of the plurality of input source devices, the respective physical address generated by an address setup unit based on the physical address of the signal switching device, such that each respective physical address corresponds to an input source device of the plurality of input source devices, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 2-9 and 36 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Oda, Kawamura and Osakabe.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Oda, Kawamura and/or Osakabe or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Oda, Kawamura and/or Osakabe to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-9 and 36 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 4-6, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oda in view of Osakabe, Kawamura and Davies, it is respectfully submitted that Davies does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from Oda, Kawamura and Osakabe, as discussed above. Therefore, no obvious combination of Oda, Osakabe, Kawamura and Davies would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-9 and 36 that depend therefrom.

Amended independent claims 22, 24 and 26 are directed to a method, a program and a device, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is

respectfully submitted that claims 22, 24 and 26 are allowable over any combination of Oda, Kawamura, Osakabe and/or Davies.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Masazumi YAMADA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.04.15 13:30:36 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 15, 2009